REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Christiansen et al. (U. S. Patent 5,983,302; hereinafter Christiansen). In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 3, 4, and 7 as being unpatentable over Christiansen in view of Bennett (U. S. Patent 6,679,904). The Office Action also rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christian in view of Bennett and further in view of Rossum (U. S. Patent 6,622,207). Claims 1-8 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Christiansen. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

1. With respect to claim 1, the present invention is directed to a method of bus priority arbitration driven by data used in a bus system. The bus system comprises a bus and a plurality of masters connected to the bus. Each master can output a request for a grant to use the bus. In order to have better efficiency, the present invention responds to the request of each master according to a predefined orderly rotation. Then, the response to the requests of the maters stops according to the predefined orderly rotation when a data for one of the masters is ready.

More specifically, the master, which is ready in preparing data and wait for the grant to use the bus, is attributed a highest priority to access the bus. ***In other words, the present invention***

does not treat the maters by equal priority.

In re Christiansen, the equal access arbitration scheme, such as a round robin arbitration scheme, is used. Or, a fixed, sequential order, is used as the equal access arbitration scheme. (col. 5, lines 50-54).

In Fig. 2 (col. 6, lines 27-30), only the Video input DMA controller can be assigned with higher priority by implementing *the arbitration critical line 32*. This mechanism is different from the present invention. It should be noted that, only the master with the *arbitration critical line 32* can have higher priority, while the other are treated as equal priority.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the Office Action refers to col. 6, lines 27-37 about the disclosure on the attributing the highest priority, as stated in Page 3 of the Office Action.

2. With respect to dependent claims 2, 5 and 6, for at least the same foregoing reasons, claims 2, 5 and 6 are not disclosed by Christiansen.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

The Office Action rejected claims 3, 4, and 7 as being unpatentable over Christiansen in view of Bennett. The Office Action rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christian in view of Bennett and further in view of Rossum. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

1. With respect to independent claims 3 and 4, for at least the same foregoing reasons applied to independent claim 1, claims 3 and 4 are not disclosed even if Bennett is in

combination. Bennett discloses the round robin bur arbitrator, which is operated under the equal priority (see col. 5, lines 50-51 in Christiansen).

2. With respect to independent claim 7, for at least the same foregoing reasons applied to independent claim 1, independent claim 1 is not disclosed even if Bennett is in combination. Bennett discloses the round robin bur arbitrator, which is operated under the equal priority (see col. 5, lines 50-51 in Christiansen).

3. With respect to dependent claim 8, Rossum is further cited in combination with Christiansen and Bennett. However, Rossum does not supply the missing features in Christiansen and Bennett. For at least the same foregoing reasons applied to independent claim 7, features recited in dependent claim 8 is not disclosed by the prior art references.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 7 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-6 and 8 patently define over the prior art references as well.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-8 of the invention patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 1/13/2005

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809